



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

sion to a thought which in this respect can be considered as one of the productive germs of the poetry of the Psalms, 1 Sam. xv., 22, 23: "Hath Jehovah as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of Jehovah? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, to hearken than the fat of rams; for disobedience is the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is teraphim-wickedness."

There are scarcely two books which furnish a greater contrast in their contents than Solomon's Song and the Book of Job; the former bounds like a gazelle in the spring-time and sunshine, the latter wades through the mire of deep suffering and enigma; and between them the Book of Proverbs moves with a cheerful earnestness through the "vanity fair" of life. But all three books are of one character. They are not specifically Israelitic, but place themselves upon the basis of pure humanity. The allegorical interpretation of Canticles makes Solomon a prophet or a mystic, but he was neither the one nor the other.

The epos and the drama are peculiar to the Indo-Germanic race. The peoples of Islam first received epics and dramas through the Persians who were converted to Islam; but in the time of Solomon the Israelitish literature was removed only a step from the development of the drama. The Song of Solomon and the Book of Job are dramas: the one, even as the ancients called it, is a comedy, the other a tragedy. But the one still lies in the swaddling-clothes of lyric poetry, and the other in the swaddling-clothes of historiography. The Book of Job also resembles the classic tragedy in other respects. Job is a tragic hero. He maintains an unshaken consciousness of his innocence before the decree which crushes him like fate. But the result of the drama is not here, as in the ancient tragedies, that the fate destroys him, but that Job's idea of the fate (*decretum absolutum*) itself, that is, his false conception of God, is annihilated as a phantom of temptation.—*From Delitzsch's O. T. History of Redemption.*

The Sources of the Chronicler.—I. It is clear that when the Chronicler refers to the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel, 1 Chron. ix., 1, 2 Chron. xvi., 11, xxv., 26, xxvii., 7, xxviii., 26, xxxii., 32, xxxv., 27, xxxvi., 8, or to the Book of Kings, 2 Chron. xx., 34, or to the Midrash (Commentary) of the Book of Kings, 2 Chron. xxiv., 27, he does not intend our Book of Kings, for many reasons, of which we give the following examples:—

1. The canonical Books of Kings do not contain the registration of all Israel, which is assigned to the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah, 1 Chron. ix., 1: "So all Israel were reckoned by genealogies: and, behold, they were written in the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah."

2. If we translate 2 Chron. xx., 32, "Now the rest of the acts of Jehoshaphat, first and last, behold, they are written in the words of Jehu the son of Hanani, which were received [instead of 'mentioned,' as in the English version] into the Book of the Kings of Israel," we find that while Jehu is mentioned as prophesying against Baasha, he has nothing to say about Jehoshaphat.

3. The rest of the acts of Amaziah, first and last, 2 Chron. xxv., 26, and the rest of the acts of Jotham, xxvii., 7, and all his wars and his ways, are not found in the canonical Books of Kings, since the same material, in almost the same form, and more complete, is found in Chronicles (compare 2 Kgs. xiv., 1-20 with 2 Chron. xxv.; 2 Kgs. xv. 32-38 with 2 Chron. xxvii.).

4. Manasseh's prayer unto God, and the words of the seers that spake to him,

2 Chron. xxxiii., 18, are not given in our Books of Kings (compare 2 Kgs. xxii., 1–18 with 2 Chron. xxxiii., 1–20).

II. It is certain that the Chronicler refers to works which are not contained in our canonical books.

1. The visions of Iddo (or Jedo, who was perhaps another person from those who follow) the seer against Jeroboam the son of Nebat, 2 Chron. ix., 29; the words of Iddo the seer concerning genealogies, 2 Chron. xii., 15; and the Commentary (Midrash) of Iddo, 2 Chron. xiii., 22, do not occur in our Books of Kings, but probably refer to writings of the persons named which were used by the Chronicler.

2. The acts of Uzziah, which were written by Isaiah the son of Amoz, 2 Chron. xxvi., 22, are neither to be found in the canonical Books of Kings nor in the prophecy of Isaiah, who, to be sure, mentions Uzziah, Isa. i., 1, vi., 1, as he does Jotham and Ahaz, i., 1, vii., 1, 3, 10, 12, xiv. 28, xxxviii., 8. But it is clear that the writing of Isaiah in regard to Uzziah is entirely independent of such a passing notice as he gives him in his prophecy.

3. The Commentary on the Book of Kings, which is quoted as giving particulars respecting the sons of Joash, the greatness of the burdens laid upon him, and the repairing of the house of God, 2 Chron. xxiv., 27, is no longer in existence, but was still accessible to the Chronicler and his contemporaries.

4. Since we have established the independence of these sources, it seems to us in the highest degree improbable, that when the Chronicler mentions other authorities whose names appear in our Books of Kings, he simply refers, after the Jewish fashion, to sections where their names occur.

(1) When he quotes the words of Samuel the seer as one of his authorities for the life of David, 1 Chron. xxix., 29, he evidently refers to one of the sources of our two canonical books which were originally one.

(2) If, however, we understand him as quoting historical documents of Samuel, what is to prevent us from understanding that Nathan the prophet and Gad the seer were the authors of other documents, from which the Chronicler might have derived his account of the activity of the priests and Levites in the time of David? This supposition derives some probability from 2 Chron. xxix., 25: "And he set the Levites in the house of the Lord with cymbals, with psalteries, and with harps, according to the commandment of David, and Gad the king's seer, and Nathan the prophet, for so was the commandment of the Lord by His prophets." Since Gad's words are as fully given in 1 Chron. xxi., 9–19 as in 2 Sam. xxiv., 11–19, we have good reason for believing that, as we have already intimated, he is author of an independent work.

(3) The Chronicler cites Shemaiah with Iddo as containing the acts of Rehoboam first and last, 2 Chron. xii., 15; but he could not have referred to 1 Kgs. xii., 22–24, where Shemaiah's prophecy occurs, which he repeats with slight variations, 2 Chron. xi., 2–4. Shemaiah has undoubtedly given fuller accounts of Rehoboam's reign than are found in these three verses.

(4) We have no warrant for understanding that one original Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel is indicated under the different authorities which are quoted. This conclusion has been drawn from 2 Chron. xx., 34, which mentions that the Book of Jehu the son of Hanani was embodied in the Book of Kings, and from xxxii., 32, where many read, "In the vision of Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz, in the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel." The singling out of these two books

as being reckoned under the Book of Kings would naturally lead us to suppose that the others were not reckoned in the same category. Besides, it is doubtful, in the second case, whether the vision of Isaiali is not to be understood as an authority besides the Book of Kings. This meaning is favored by the translation of the Septuagint, which, together with Chaldee, is followed by the English version.

(5) When we duly weigh all these points, we do not wonder that Graf was at last inclined to admit that he had gone too far in maintaining that the Chronicler had only freely adapted our Books of Kings to his own views. We have, as it seems to us, abundantly shown that the Chronicler had reliable authorities, and that the assumption that he has deliberately changed the historical facts for a didactic purpose, is entirely without foundation.

(6) The question now remains, In what shape did he consult these authorities? Professor Dr. Franz Delitzsch, my honored friend and teacher, answers the question as follows:—The Chronicler had (1) our two Books of Samuel; (2) our two Books of Kings; (3) a *Midrash Sepher ha-Melakim*,—that is, a commentary on an older Book of Kings,—in which this older book was illustrated by excerpts out of the official annals of Judah and Israel, and out of many prophetic documents of different times. It is probable that Ezra was the compiler of this great work, which closed with the history of his own time.

While we hold, with Professor Delitzsch, that the Chronicler had our Books of Samuel and Kings, we find no adequate proof that the mass of the material was comprehended under a compilation from the older documents named, or that that the expression *Midrash Sepher ha-Melakim* is equivalent to *Sepher Malche Israel ve Jehuda*. (a) As we have already observed, there is no evidence that *Dibre Nathan*, *Dibre Gad*, *Nebuath Ahijah*, *Chazoth Yedo*, *Dibre Shemaiah*, *Dibre Iddo*, and *Midrash Iddo* were contained in one work. Indeed, it is far more probable that they existed as independent documents. The fact that the work of Jehu the son of Hanani is mentioned as being embodied in the Book of Kings, 2 Chron. xx., 34, does not indicate that those above mentioned were collected in the same work; it rather shows that the others were not included in it. (b) Although the Chronicler does not quote his main source without some slight variations, yet we cannot argue from this that he considers *Midrash Sepher ha-Melachim* equivalent to *Sepher Malche Israel*, which he mentions twice, or to *Sepher Malche Jehuda ve Israel*, to which he refers four times, much less that the above-mentioned documents of Nathan, Gad, etc., were all constituent parts of a larger work.

(7) Our theory is that the Chronicler had access to these documents, which all illustrated the history of the regal period, and with which he was perfectly familiar. Since we cannot identify the *Sepher Malche Jehuda ve Israel* with *Dibre ha-Yamim*, which is so often quoted in the Book of Kings, it is probable that our present Books of Samuel and Kings lay before our author, from which he took the basis of an enlarged and modified work, which was enriched by the sources already mentioned, and which truly represents the course of history during the regal period from a Levitical standpoint.—*From Curtiss' The Levitical Priests.*

The Historical Standpoint.—It is of the first importance, in interpreting a written document, to ascertain who the author was, and to determine the time, the